

JPRS 79759

30 December 1981

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1955

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

30 December 1981

EAST EUROPE REPORT
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1955

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- 'SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE' Reviews Book on International Relations
(SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, May 81) 1

POLAND

- Envoy in Bangkok Denies Walesa Arrest
(AFP, 16 Dec 81) 2

YUGOSLAVIA

- Criticism of Commemoration of U.S.-Serbian Treaty Rebutted
(Radivoj Cveticanin; POLITIKA, 14 Nov 81) 3
- Kosovo Ex-Leaders Alleged To Have Covered Up Scandals
(Viktor Cikes; DUGA, 26 Sep 81) 6
- Pristina Opstina League of Communists Forms Nine Centers,
Decides on Elections
(M. Antic; BORBA, 25 Nov 81) 10
- LCY Leadership Electoral Procedures Under Discussion
(Stevan Niksic; NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE, 15 Nov 81) .. 12
- Sarajevo Daily Polemicizes Harshly With Belgrade Weekly
(Petar Jovic; NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE, 1, 15 Nov 81).. 18
- Original Attack From 'OSLOBODJENJE'
Response From Targeted Periodical
Rebuttal From 'OSLOBODJENJE'
- Croatian Official Cites Resurgence of Bureaucratism
(Vjekoslav Koprivnjak Interview; NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE
NOVINE, 25 Oct 81) 28

'SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE' REVIEWS BOOK ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Warsaw SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE in Polish No 5, May 81 p 166

[Review by A.Z. of book "Teoria Polityki i Stosunkow Miedzynarodowych" [The Theory of Politics and International Relations] published by the Central Methodological Institute for Political Science Studies, Warsaw, 1979, 297 pages]

[Text] This work comprises 11 studies on the theory of politics and international relations. One article, by W. Szczepanski, attempts to present the general methodological relations and assumptions which exist between the theory of politics and the theory of international relations. Szczepanski proposes the thesis that in Marxist studies on politics two approaches can be distinguished: the procedural examination of political experience; and the behavioral or subjective-behavioral formulation. In another study by Szczepanski, one can find a reconstruction of the basic political goals of de Gaulle concerning the French vision of European development. W. Kostecki presents the main research directions in the Polish study of international relations in the 1970's. He shows the development of the study of international relations as a social process which permits a gradual passage from ignorance, everyday knowledge and a superficial view of political phenomena occurring in the international experience to genuine knowledge based on coherent canons of scientific cognition. E. Palyga defines three concepts which are used--most often interchangeably--in the study of international relations: foreign policy, international policy and external policy.

CSO: 2600/128

ENVOY IN BANGKOK DENIES WALESA ARREST

BK160915 Hong Kong AFP in English 0856 GMT 16 Dec 81

[Text] Bangkok, 16 Dec (AFP)--Polish Ambassador to Thailand Jan Majewski today categorically denied reports that Lech Walesa, leader of the Polish Independent Trade Union Movement Solidarity, was under house arrest. Mr Walesa is in Warsaw "having talks with authorities," the ambassador told a news briefing here.

The situation in Poland, he maintained, is "under control." "Order is being slowly restored" and the Military Council that came into power after a "state of war" was declared would cease to function when normalcy is regained. The state of emergency, called Sunday, was not directed against Solidarity, he said. The move was intended to quash "groups," inside Solidarity and elsewhere, that had caused "disorder," he added.

The suspension of trade union activities was "only a temporary measure," he said. "Democracy and freedom cannot be introduced through disorder and lawlessness," he added.

The ambassador at the same time stressed "we want to solve the problem by ourselves." He said the Soviet Union had sent food aid and ducked questions on any other Soviet role.

The ambassador maintained that no one had been put under arrest. An unknown number had been "interned" and strict orders had been issued to "avoid any use of violence," he added.

Meanwhile, the ambassador announced that Polish Deputy Foreign Minister Tadeusz Olechowski had postponed a scheduled visit to Thailand as well as a trip to Vientiane. In an interview with AFP earlier today, the envoy had (?been) unclear about the deputy minister's plans for Vientiane where he was to attend a 2-day gathering, due to begin today, of deputy foreign ministers of Indochinese states and their Soviet-backed allies. Mr Olechowski was to fly in here Friday, after the Vientiane meeting, to return a visit to Warsaw late last year by Thailand's Deputy Foreign Minister Arun Phanphong.

In a related development, Thai trade unions have announced plans to stage a demonstration outside the Polish Embassy here tomorrow.

CSO: 2020/12

CRITICISM OF COMMEMORATION OF U.S.-SERBIAN TREATY REBUTTED

Belgrade POLITIKA in Serbo-Croatian 14 Nov 81 p 10

[Article by Radivoj Cveticanin: "Far From the Piedmont"]

[Text] Our public is not accustomed to the type of article on Yugoslavia's foreign policy which speaks about it in critical terms. To put it simply, they are rare, if they exist at all. That is why every such piece of writing, even though it may be concerned with the secondary details of that policy, arouses particular attention when it appears. With respect to certain of its elements the comment by Jako Stular entitled "The Other Side of the Coin of a Centennial," published in the Ljubljana newspaper DELO the Saturday before last, falls in that category. It will certainly be interesting to examine it.

Stular was motivated to write the comment "The Other Side of the Coin ...," it seems to us, by the following TANJUG news item on 26 October: "A meeting of American and Yugoslav historians opened today in Belgrade in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of establishment of diplomatic relations between the SFRY and the United States." Stular extracted from the TANJUG item, which obviously was somewhat longer, only another few lines to the effect that "Charles Jelavich's paper on American views of Serbia in the 1870's and 1880's was particularly interesting...."

What the commentator in DELO wanted to emphasize was that he had listened to what the "Voice of America" had had to say about the same event--that is, the 100th anniversary of establishment of diplomatic relations between what at that time was Serbia and the United States. In developing the entire matter he has as a rule given preference to the "Voice of America" over the meeting of historians--preference, that is, in having understood the event correctly.

Nowhere does Stular mention that he had undertaken anything at all detailed in connection with the meeting of historians: neither that he had attended the meeting, nor that he had informed himself about the papers delivered at it. But this did not stand in his way from blowing up the importance of the centennial to unnatural proportions and from deriving certain far-reaching conclusions concerning the meeting. For example: that relations had existed between the United States and the people of Yugoslavia before the Serbia-American agreement--which supposedly had been well noted by the "Voice of America," but had not been seen by the historians at the round table in Belgrade. What is more,

35 years after World War II, as he puts it, they were trying to sing the melody of the "Staatstragender Nation," that is, of a nationality seeking statehood, on "Piedmontese strings." At the end of his article Stular referred to the historians as "historians" and emphasized once again that this was an attempt at "parading ... Piedmontism on the worn-out velvet of the Obrenovic monarchy."

There are other lessons in political history in and among the key conclusions: that the Serbia of that time, which signed the treaty with America, was Obrenovic Serbia and that its "sole program" was Garasanin's "Nacertanije" [Conception], with its project of creating Great Serbia, and that Garasanin's conception was destroyed at Jajce in 1943 (!), and further, that in the last century, when the treaty was signed between Serbia and America, most of what is today Yugoslavia was under another monarchy, which also had regularized relations with the United States (from which it perhaps should follow that we could also celebrate establishment of relations between Austro-Hungary and the United States), and more along that line.

The round table was held in Belgrade 26 and 27 October and was sponsored by the Institute for Contemporary History. Its organizers were interested in emphasizing that this round table was to some extent a continuation of the cooperation between American and Yugoslav historians which commenced in a similar form a few years ago at Plitvice when scholars from the two countries discussed American-Yugoslav relations in the National Liberation Struggle. D. Zivojinovic spoke about the independence of Serbia in the policy of the United States in the 1878-1881 period, Charles Jelavich spoke on the topic already mentioned, M. Bulajic spoke on establishment of diplomatic relations between the Kingdom of Serbia and the United States, Barbara Jelavich on the implications of Balkan movements for national liberation, I. Cizmici on Yugoslav emigres in the United States at the end of the last century, and John Lampe about Belgrade and Washington in the light of modernization of cities. The discussion offered two interesting contributions on volunteers in Serbia's war with Turkey in 1878 and on economic relations between Serbia and the United States before World War I.

It is evident even from this that this round table was not very wide ranging, which is perhaps in line with the organizers' ambition that the historians confine themselves to treatment of the event which occurred in 1881. D. Zivojinovic made the assertion that "establishment of Serbian-American relations represents an episode in Serbia's struggle for political independence." Nothing more than that; it probably would not have been possible to say less.

There was, then, no singing on Piedmontese strings concerning a nationality seeking statehood.

It seems, however, that Stular was not so much bothered by the historians, not even as "historians" (the devil take them!), but by certain others and something else. Stated in the terms of the adage: Stular was scolding his daughter-in-law, but his words were meant for his daughter.

The idea emerged more or less clearly that the treaty between Serbia and the United States is looked upon as a "Serbian" matter and not a "Yugoslav" matter by any means. Following that line, it is then clear why the illusion of former

times about "Serbia as a Piedmont" and about the Serbian nation as a people seeking statehood, which existed at one time and has today been forgotten, was revived. Stular himself was to say this (and we will join him in that): this group of ideas about Serbia as a pillar of Yugoslavia has long and definitively belonged to the arsenal of the absolute past. Nor does the issue lie in agreement on that point; the issue is whether retrograde ideas have emerged concerning celebration of the 100th anniversary of diplomatic relations between Serbia and the United States, and that here and now.

Dr Milan Bulajic is a man who holds a competent position in the Secretariat for Foreign Affairs. He says: "Intergovernmental relations ... on the basis of continuity of international obligations, were carried over from the Kingdom of Serbia to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, from the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia."

Nor is it difficult to discover from reliable sources that the entire task of celebrating the 100th anniversary of diplomatic relations between Yugoslavia and the United States traveled from the Secretariat for Foreign Affairs, the Federal Executive Council and the SAWPY to the Federal Bureau for International Cultural Cooperation, that is, through governmental and political organs and institutions at the federal level. It is obvious that this matter was not illegal in the least.

Far be it for us to wish to put a gag on Stular; we fear only that the facts we have presented themselves do that ineluctably. We understand that it is easier to strike a blow at a meeting of historians than any of the institutions mentioned. Easier it is, but not more gracious.

7045

CSO: 2800/125

KOSOVO EX-LEADERS ALLEGED TO HAVE COVERED UP SCANDALS

Belgrade DUGA in Serbo-Croatian No 198, 26 Sep 81 pp 20-21

[Article by Viktor Cikes: "Punishment for Dedication"]

[Text] Some members of the provincial leadership in Kosovo have covered up many incidents for years. One of them was malversation, which was discovered by market inspectors in the housing enterprise in Pristina and because of their work they have experienced many difficulties.

What happened in 1975 and 1976 when Dzevat Berisa, Velibor Adamovic and Dimitrije Ljiljak, having examined the records of a Pristina housing enterprise, found that it had acquired a profit of 14,614,722.57 dinars in an unlawful manner? Here, briefly, are the stories, which can be confirmed by numerous documents.

In Pristina, as well as everywhere in Yugoslavia, within the scope of normal supervision and on the basis of instructions from the Federal and Provincial Inspectorate, at that time prices were being controlled in several work organizations. The market inspectors of the Pristina Federal Committee then examined the records of the housing enterprise mentioned above.

Here is what Velibor Adamovic says about the work he was doing at that time:

"Disregarding the threats that we would be released from our duties, the arrogant behavior of representatives of the enterprise, and the continual resistance encountered in the obtaining of records, we concluded our work after 4 months and established beyond a doubt that the collective had realized a difference in value of 14,614,722.57 dinars by unlawful actions during the period of 1972 to 1975."

Along with an extensive explanation of all of the findings, the decision was made to take away the unlawful profits, and the inspectors believed that with this action their part of the job was finished. The various means of public communication reported the results of their work, along with the blessings of the president of the Executive Council of the Pristina Federal Committee.

"Witch-hunting"

Immediately after the appearance of the information concerning the findings of the inspectors, the Executive Council of the Pristina Federal Committee held

a meeting in which they protested against giving this information to the public. On this occasion the deputy of the secretary of the Municipal Committee appraised the work of the inspectors as being destructive and contrary to the judgments of the Municipal Committee. Desiring to protect the inspectors from this unexpected attack, the Federal Market Inspectorate interceded in writing on their behalf to the president of the Executive Council of the province, the president of the Pristina Federal Committee, and the president of the Executive Council of the Pristina Federal Committee, evaluating the work of the inspectors in the housing enterprise as very professional, based on the law and in the spirit of the 10th meeting of the Central Committee of the LCY.

"However," continues Velibor Adamovic, "it did not stop some people from the Municipal Committee and the Pristina Federal Committee from forming a commission with the task of refuting our findings in the housing enterprise from a professional point of view. This commission worked in secret, and we knew nothing of its existence or its activities. This commission, as we were to find out later, was discontinued because of the conviction of its members that it was not competent to evaluate our expertise."

In the meantime, the housing enterprise submitted a complaint for a decision concerning the return of the unlawfully acquired profits. The Provincial Secretariat for Economic Matters, as a secondary organ, exempted the collective from all findings of the market inspector's report, except for the part in which the enterprise was obliged to return 119,509.60 dinars for charging and obtaining a higher rental fee for office space. On this occasion the decision concerning the obligatory return of the rental fee for the office space to the level prescribed in November 1971 was confirmed. The director of the housing enterprise at that time was Maksim Krdzic, and his deputy was Zuhra Bakali, wife of Mahmut Bakali.

Dissatisfied with this decision, the Secretariat for Inspection Affairs of the Pristina Federal Committee appealed in writing to the president of the Executive Council, the president of the Presidency and the president of the Parliament of the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo. In the letter to these forums, he called attention to the decision of the Provincial Secretariat for Economic Matters and sought a response to the question of who the person was who had processed the secondary decision. However, there was no response. Instead, the Municipal Committee formed a commission which had the assignment of determining the political position and the motives for the inspection of the housing enterprise of the market inspectors Dzevat Berisa, Velibor Adamovic, and Dimitrije Ljiljak, as well as of the secretary of the Secretariat for Inspection Affairs of the Pristina Federal Committee Mentor Jakupi.

The commission was composed of the deputy of the president of the Municipal Committee of the League of Communists, Jusuf Zejnulahu, the president of the Executive Council of the Pristina Federal Committee, Bora Vasic, the president of the Supreme Court of the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo, Riza Fazlija, and the editor of Radio-Pristina, Saban Hiseni. The last person mentioned was later in several responsible positions, and after the disagreeable events of March of that year in Kosovo, the name of Saban Hiseni was linked with

the removal of the slogan "Our Tito, yesterday, today, and tomorrow." Of course, Hiseni's political orientation is clear today, but when he, as a member of the commission, evaluated the moral character of the inspectors, it was known that by verdict of the Military Court in Skopje he had been sentenced to 3 months imprisonment for evading his military obligation. Remembering the hearing before this commission, Velibor Adamovic says:

"I can't present the manner in which the hearing was conducted in detail, but I can tell you that what was presented was quite false and was directed at fabricating completely different motives for our work in the housing project."

The commission concluded that the inspectors had worked outside of their authority, creating chaos and discord, discrediting the work of the League of Communists and individual officials. This information was received by the Municipal Committee, and on 30 March 1976 the inspectors were expelled from the League of Communists, and information about all of this was provided to the public news media.

Without the Proper Responses

While the commission was establishing the political orientation of the inspectors, the Supreme Court of Kosovo got to the complaint filed by the Secretariat for Inspection Affairs concerning the secondary decision. In a closed session on 7 May 1976, the Court rejected the complaint and instructed that the matter be decided in the District Economic Court. The president of the Supreme Court of the Province was also on the commission which discredited the work of the inspectors!

After they were expelled from the League of Communists and were relieved of their duties, Dzevat Berisa, Velibor Adamovic, Dimitrije Ljiljak, and Mentor Jakupi appealed to Comrade Dolanc, presenting all the details of the case.

"It was indeed quite a trying matter," continues Velibor Adamovic. "In Pristina I lived in an apartment whose owner was the shock-absorber factory, where I had worked at one time. As luck would have it, after the events at the housing enterprise Maksim Krdiz was transferred to a new position, right in the shock-absorber factory. While I was staying in Belgrade, he broke into my apartment with several uniformed persons and threw out all my belongings. I tried to find out by whose order this had been done. In the Ministry for Internal Affairs I was told that the police did not take part in forced evictions. Then I found out that verbal permission for this action had been given by the judge of the Municipal Court in Pristina Spasoje Komatina. Allegedly he had heard that I had moved out and that some other person had moved into the apartment by force, so he had approved a request to remove the belongings of the illegal tenant. In this type of situation, where our existence was threatened from all sides, we had to appeal to Comrade Dolanc. When they found out about this letter, comrades from the Presidency of the Political Committee of the League of Communists called us in for a talk. On this occasion there was no reprimand directed at our work, except for one to our former secretary which referred to the manner of informing the public about the work of market inspectors. We had some talks with the Commission for Statutory Questions of the Municipal Committee of the League of

Communists of Pristina, and at that time we were told that there was no proof which would endanger our political standing. At the end, the president of this commission told us that he would annul the decision concerning our expulsion from the party. Unfortunately, nothing came of this.

Having realized that it was futile to seek confirmation of the truth on the provincial level, the inspectors turned to the president of the Republic on 18 January 1977. The Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia-Commission for Petitions and Complaints, at a meeting on 28 October 1977, took the position that the entire dossier of the case be sent to the Presidency of the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo, with the request that it examine the case, and that the inspectors be informed about the position adopted. The case has not been considered to this time from the point of view of the authorized commission. The inspectors, however, have been freed from guilt, and the new Statutory Commission of the Municipal Committee of the League of Communists in Pristina has returned them to membership in the League of Communists.

Unfortunately, there is not an appropriate end to this entire story, because it still remains unclear as to whether or not the inspectors were mistaken in their examination of the books of the housing enterprise. If they were not, what happened to those 14,614,722.57 dinars?

9548

CSO: 2800/103

PRISTINA OPSTINA LEAGUE OF COMMUNISTS FORMS NINE CENTERS, DECIDES ON ELECTIONS

Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 25 Nov 81 p 3

[Article by M. Antic]

[Text] Elections are not merely a statutory obligation.

A resolution has been approved on the formation of nine regional centers for organization for the LCY opstina organization. The opstina elective conference will have 263 delegates, who will elect an opstina committee of 55 members that will constitute the highest LCY agency in the opstina.

Pristina, 24 November. Delegates of the Pristina LCY opstina conference today approved a resolution for ordering an election, which will be held from 1 December of this year to the end of March 1982. Another resolution was approved that spells out the nature, method of election and structure of the opstina elective conference, as well as the procedures to be followed in the election.

The Pristina LCY opstina conference also approved a resolution on the formation of regional organizational forms for the LCY in the opstina. According to this resolution, the Pristina LCY opstina organization will be formed into nine regional centers, with three in the city itself and six in the surrounding communities or villages of Kosovo Polje, Obilic, Devet Jugovica, Kacikolo, Novo Brdo and Gracanica.

It was essential that that form of organization of the Pristina LCY opstina organization be adopted, because the organization has 21,000 members organized into 567 basic LCY organizations, and it would be difficult for a single committee to maintain constant contact with the total membership and all the basic LCY organizations.

According to the resolution approved today, the Pristina LCY opstina election conference will include 263 delegates, each representing 80 communists. The opstina election conference will select an opstina committee of 55 members as the highest party agency in the opstina. From its membership the opstina committee will elect a 13-member presidium as the collective executive-political agency; its work in turn will be directed by a president, who will be elected for 1 year.

The tasks of the communists in the Pristina opstina during the election process were addressed by the executive secretary of the Pristina LCY opstina committee, Daut Jasanica. He noted that the point of departure for the overall activities of communists during the election process should be the LCY Central Committee Platform regarding Kosovo, and the Kosovo LCY Province Committee's Action Program, as well as the determination that the Pristina LCY has not been functioning at the level of the circumstances in which it finds itself. This fact was demonstrated last summer, when Albanian nationalists and irredentists organized counterrevolutionary demonstrations. Further causes of counterrevolutionary activities have been cited in the Platform and Action Program mentioned above.

In closing the session, Nebi Gasi, president of the Pristina LCY opstina committee, warned that the elections would be held under complicated political circumstances, in which the enemy continues to be active. That will require a higher degree of caution and readiness from all communists.

Finally, he warned of the need for greater vigilance from all working people and citizens who are communists during the coming days and the coming holiday of 29 November, Day of the Republic, for there are indications that the enemy wishes to cause disorder and uncertainty among the populace. To that end, new hostile actions have been announced. Gasi concluded: "We must be prepared and must resist every provocation."

12,131

CSO: 2800/109

LCY LEADERSHIP ELECTORAL PROCEDURES UNDER DISCUSSION

Belgrade NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE in Serbo-Croatian No 1611, 15 Nov 81
pp 8-10

[Article by Stevan Niksic]

[Text] Many topics in the domain of "internal relations" within the party have come up for discussion in the recent past: disagreements about interpretation of the principle of democratic centralism; differing assessments of possible directions and the pace of democratization in the League of Communists; dilemmas about the way in which the leadership should be elected and organized....

In a meeting of the LCY Central Committee next week there will again be discussion of the preparations of the 12th LCY Congress, which is to be held next summer. During this past week topics concerning the congress were also dominant at several political meetings all over the country as well as at those in federal forums.

Encounter With the Truth

"It is high time that the League of Communists be concerned with itself, with its behavior, since this is an obligation of ours on behalf of the prestige which it has among the working people," observed Milan Pavic, one of the participants in last week's meeting of the LCC [League of Communists of Croatia] Central Committee. Several significant judgments expressed in that meeting are a good illustration of the temperature of the preparations for the congress.

Petar Sitvuk, for example, advocated that the party "be purged of its weak members, the riffraff"; Jakov Sirotkovic expressed the opinion that the strategic lines of development should be examined once again; Cedo Grbic expressed the assessment that for a long time the League of Communists has been on the defensive with respect to the development of self-management and socioeconomic relations; "The most essential thing for us is to turn our dissatisfaction into constructive social action," Jovo Ugrcic believes; Nada Radosevic called attention to the attacks which distinguished leaders have been making upon one another through the press and public statements, noting that this indicates "insufficient coordination" among leadership bodies in the republics. She noted that the leaders in the Federation and the republic sometimes say one thing (about prices and shortages, for example), and the very next day it happens otherwise,

which "causes confusion at the base" and "distrust of leadership personnel"; "The people and the working class have confidence," Ljubo Braski judges, but he nevertheless noted that "we should not be excessively carried away with this. Let us not run from the truth," he said.

On that same occasion Milka Planinc, president of the LCC Central Committee, spoke among other things about democratization in the League of Communists. For understandable reasons related above all to performance of the role of the League of Communists in society and in the political system, that role which was set forth in the positions adopted by the 11th LCY Congress, but which has not been performed with sufficient consistency in the general judgment; that topic is again coming up in many debates concerning the congress. The program for democratization of society cannot be created, nor carried out, unless a democratic spirit and democratic relations are developed within the League of Communists, M. Planinc observed. But at the same time she criticized "certain of our comrades" for "advocating an open and free dialogue concerning all the strategic issues of society on behalf of some different democracy," charging them with "losing sight of criteria and perspectives."

Dialogue

It has become possible even now to speak about an entire panorama of differing opinions concerning the role and importance of dialogue in the context of the process of democratization within the party and of democratic centralism, opinions uttered since commencement of the pregress "summing up." Aleksandar Grlickov, member of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, for example, indicated another aspect of the same problem a month ago in an interview (START, 10 October 1981). Noting "that we have flagged in the pace of opening up dialogue," he expressed the opinion that it plays into the hands of the dogmatic forces to suppress dialogue in the League of Communists and in society.

From the rostrum of the Marxist Center of the Belgrade City LC Conference one of the participants in last week's debate (D. Draskovic), declaring himself in favor of creating an atmosphere of frank critical dialogue within the League of Communists and in society ("but not for us to speak about not having a headache"), expressed displeasure that one distinguished official (D. Kosovac) referred to another (S. Vukmanovic "Tempo") in public as amoral. If the people who hold high positions in society address one another in that fashion, what will then be the case when the debates take place in everyday life about income and similar matters, he said. A similar opinion is held by Ratko Butulija, secretary of the city committee, who said that in many quarters there is no true democratic atmosphere in which views are exchanged in a reasoned manner, that often epithets are uttered hastily and unthinkingly....

The debates on dialogue are just one part of a much broader and far more significant topic, the issue of democratic centralism, which has set the tone for the pregress discussions to date. In the report of the Commission of the LCY Central Committee for Organizational Affairs and the Bylaws, which was created in the context of the preparations for the 12th congress, there is mention inter alia of misunderstanding, of a one-sided conception, and even of questioning the value of the "current importance of democratic centralism. There are tendencies,"

the report says, "for the LC to introduce the principle of federalistic relations in LCY organs instead of democratic centralism, for democratic centralism in the LCY to be set up in antagonistic opposition to conclusion of social compacts and self-management accords, for democratic centralism to be broken down into its components....

In the discussion already mentioned in the Marxist Center in Belgrade the judgment was expressed (by Balsa Spadijer) that the decisions and views adopted in the League of Communists are not being consistently taken up precisely because their preparation and adoption were not carried out in a consistently democratic way. One consequence of this mechanically created unity is the frequent observation that we have good positions, that we are not carrying them out or that we are not united in carrying out what has been agreed on.

How are the members of the LCY Central Committee elected, and to whom are they accountable? A highly compounded tale hangs on this apparently simple and, one would say, purely technical problem. Its nuances reflect all the complexity of the dialectical relationship between the LCY as a unified organization and the leagues of communists in the republics and provinces which make it up but which are at the same time independent organizations.

Recalling the fact that members of the LCY Central Committee are elected in the republics and provinces and that their election is only verified in the LCY Congress ("There has never been a case when someone was not verified"), Ivan Laca expressed the opinion last week in the Marxist Center in Belgrade that this was "very hard" evidence of the existence of elements of federalism in the League of Communists. Just 1 day later this topic was discussed in a meeting of the commission of the LCY Central Committee which is preparing proposals for amendment of the present party bylaws. Opinions of the corresponding commissions in the republics and provinces were also gathered in advance.

The report of the commission of the LCMo [League of Communists of Montenegro] Central Committee suggested among other things the possibility that practice up to now in this regard might be changed somewhat: that the republic congresses and provincial conferences could merely nominate candidates for the LCY Central Committee, but they would be elected in the true sense at the Yugoslav congress. It was emphasized that the motive was not a desire to correct the present situation with respect to independence and accountability of the republics and provinces, but the need to strengthen the role of the LCY Central Committee.

In the meeting of the commission this proposal was expanded and substantiated: Stanka Glomazic-Lekovic (LCMo) proposed that members of the LCY Central Committee be nominated in the republics and provinces, but the slate of candidates would have to contain more nominees than were to be elected, and then, for the Executive Committee of the Central Committee to be elected in the LCY Congress by secret ballot. To be elected, according to this proposal, a member of the Central Committee would have to receive at least two-thirds of the votes of the delegates at the congress. A similar suggestion (secret ballot, broader list of candidates) was also made in connection with election of the members of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee.

It is interesting, however, that concerning many of the characteristic elements of these proposals the members of the Central Committee's commission did not hold an altogether identical view on whether balloting should be open or secret, on whether the slate should contain more nominees than positions; on who shall elect members of the Central Committee; or on who the members of the Central Committee are accountable to. A lively debate was conducted, but some of these have been left "open" even now.

The present LCY Bylaws are not altogether consistent in those provisions which have to do with the secret or open ballot. In election of political executive organs in the LCY, for example, a secret ballot is explicitly prescribed only for opstina organizations; this is not required at the "higher levels" in the republic and the Federation. The opinion was expressed in the commission that a uniform principle should be enforced everywhere. But when the discussion took up election of members of the future Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, noticeable differences became evident: certain members of the commission felt that a secret ballot was not necessary in this case.

Undisputed Diagnosis

Similar differences came to the surface in the debate of the principle of requiring more nominees on the slate than positions to be filled in an election. In his address at the 11th congress President Tito explicitly advocated such procedure, and his address was adopted as a document of the congress. So, with the principle of democratic centralism taken as the point of departure, it is a question of a rule which would have to be mandatory. Marija Zvekic-Miskolci (LCV [League of Communists of Vojvodina]), however, expressed the opinion that "Comrade Tito was not thinking just of the League of Communists" and that application of that principle in ethnically complicated communities might bring about certain undesirable consequences. A similar opinion was held by Bora Denkov (League of Communists of Macedonia [LCMa]), who noted that "we must be realistic" and that as to election of organs in the LCY, it would be "very difficult to carry out." The question was put: What happens if a candidate to a federal forum of the LCY does not receive the necessary number of votes? Does that automatically mean that lack of confidence has been voted in that republic or provincial organization which nominated him?

The bylaws commission did not adopt altogether definitive positions. Many proposals were stated in the form of alternatives.

To whom is the member of the LCY Central Committee accountable? Advocates of the idea that nominees would be voted on in the congress and that at least two-thirds of the votes would be required for election to the future Central Committee, feel that this would eliminate all the dilemmas about whether the member of the Central Committee represents only his parent (republic or provincial) organization or enjoys support in the entire LCY. Incidentally, in one working group of the commission for the bylaws mention was made of a possible elaboration of the principle of decisionmaking on the basis of consensus in meetings of the LCY Central Committee, but it was concluded that there was no basic justification for this, and that idea was abandoned.

Some of the proposals in this debate were interpreted in the meeting of this commission as "a return to the period of 8 years ago," to debates about the character of the entire organization of the League of Communists and of the way it is organized.

Nevertheless, in spite of certain differences over details, the dominant conviction was that several elements should be incorporated into the bylaws in order to emphasize the "cohesive role of the LCY," as stated by Hrvoje Istuk, secretary of the Presidium of the LCBH [League of Communists of Bosnia-Herzegovina] Central Committee.

The assessment that individual members of forums of the League of Communists "abstain" and "have difficulty deciding" to send out critical observations concerning what is happening in other quarters (the republics, the provinces and communes), i.e., outside their own constituency, was significant in this light. Similar judgments have also been heard at many political gatherings in the recent past. That practice, it has been said, is harmful to real unity and effectiveness of efforts as a whole. In this sense last week's meeting of the LCC Central Committee offered an encouraging example. After the criticism of the press expressed in the address of M. Planinc ("The weeklies and especially the popular magazines are more and more becoming points of support for liberalistic tendencies in society"), M. Rakas provided the additional interpretation "that this judgment does not pertain solely to periodicals whose founders are in this republic."

In the analysis of the topics and dilemmas which have been raised so far in the pre-congress discussions, one inevitably concludes that the diagnosis of the true state of affairs in society, and the LCY is a part of society in every respect, is beyond dispute, that there is complete consensus on this point. The debate about the ways and methods of changing that state of affairs, of improving it, has only now flared up. It seems that the essence of all the pre-congress discussions lies in this.

The Top Level of the Party

Those provisions which had to do with Comrade Tito and the function of the LCY president will be omitted from the future LCY Bylaws. There is agreement that in future the post of LCY president should not be reestablished. As in the past, the highest organ of the League of Communists would be the congress, which will be held every 4th year and will be similarly instituted as in the past. There is the sole possibility that the number of delegates will be somewhat smaller at future congresses than in the past. The supreme forum of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in the interval between congresses is still the Central Committee. It is not yet known whether a permanent chairman of the Central Committee will be elected (with a term of office of 1 year) or whether the meetings will be directed by a working presidium which would be elected separately on each occasion.

According to one proposal, the chairman of the Central Committee might at the same time preside over meetings of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, similar to current practice in the central (provincial) committees of the

republic or provincial organizations. However, it seems that in all the discussions of this topic to date the majority has favored that organizational structure which is in effect at present on the basis of a temporary decision concerning the bylaws: that the Presidium be elected from among the members of the Central Committee and that the Presidium elect its chairman (for 1 year) and its secretary (for 2 years) from among its own members.

Other proposals have also been mentioned. For example: that the pattern of the top level of the party which was in effect before the 10th LCY Congress be reinstated. Then the Presidium would be somewhat larger than at present and there would be a separate and smaller executive body, the Executive Bureau. The conclusions of the Commission for Organizational Affairs and the Bylaws, which was commissioned to prepare a proposed version of changes in the bylaws which will be decided upon by the next congress of the LCY, will be the subject of preliminary debate in a meeting of the LCY Central Committee. Finally, this topic will also be a matter for public discussion, as envisaged by the party bylaws. It is not precluded, then, that certain new and different proposals than those mentioned so far might be forthcoming.

7045

CSO: 2800/124

SARAJEVO DAILY POLEMICIZES HARSHLY WITH BELGRADE WEEKLY

Original Attack From 'OSLOBODJENJE'

Belgrade NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE in Serbo-Croatian No 1609, 1 Nov 81 pp 2-3

[Article by Petar Jovic originally published in OSLOBODJENJE on 22 October 1981 and reprinted in NIN, followed by response: "An Aggressive Attack by Bourgeois Consciousness"]

[Text] Petar Jovic's article entitled "An Aggressive Attack by Bourgeois Consciousness," which is mostly concerned with the writing in our magazine, was published in OSLOBODJENJE on 22 October 1981. We are reprinting this article in its entirety, followed by the response of NIN's editors.

Marxists have never underestimated the definite contributions, breakthroughs and range of bourgeois consciousness. In its description of the nature and pattern of things, this consciousness has been and remains at its own level. Whereas its "neutrality" in the arts has still been able to serve as the basis for a humanistic commitment, in its theory it has neither wished nor been able to conceal its conservative ideological and political stand.

The Offering of a Formula

In proposing solutions and strategies for overcoming a particular social situation (especially if it is complicated and difficult and involves conflicts and crisis) the representatives of bourgeois consciousness abstain and hang back, without offering any excuses. They offer nothing new, their desire is to justify and revive the old, to frighten individuals, what is more, with what the new might mean, and at the same time try to subject the new to ridicule, to doubt and to hesitation. This is what Lenin would call the "genre of the trivial," to which one might add malicious--"annoyance."

What is our behavior in the present situation? Everyone is, of course, seeking an answer to the main question--What are the reasons for the situation, how are the shortcomings to be overcome, and how are the hotbeds of the crisis situations to be eliminated? It would be natural to expect that everyone would endeavor to make a constructive contribution (except those who hold positions contrary to socialist self-management) to resolving and overcoming society's contradictions and difficulties.

A certain Nenad Kecmanovic, so it would appear in a series of articles in NIN, and critics and diagnosticians of our situation like him, are very outspoken, persistent and even aggressive in presenting their views and offering their formulas. There can be no dilemma whatsoever about all the meanings and significations of their writings: they have the best knowledge of everything--the why, the who, the when and the how; they have an answer to all possible questions. Society is at fault for not having taken those admonitions seriously and for not having taken up the dialogue. As though the absence of dialogue, the existence of taboo topics and the like are the causes of the present situation!

Operation Rescue

We must be led to reflection and concern by the fact that the advice being offered can today be placed before public notice. After all, such individuals are taking advantage of the present situation in order to call into question even those most important principles on which this community of ours is based, on which it successfully navigated the troubled sea of world events and problems after World War II and made a tremendous contribution to calming the storms of the world and to preventing a new catastrophe.

Now these freethinking critics and "saviors" obviously would like to point the ship in some other direction, to have us take shelter in some bay, to "spare" us further "troubles." But that is not all there is to it. The discrediting of everything we have so far achieved and have been achieving along our way is also an integral part of Operation Rescue.

These aggressive and brave "benefactors" have laid the blame [on the handling of] those most delicate questions of our cohesiveness and have begun their dirty work as inspectors and strategists. The relations among the nationalities--and pushing the argument that all nationalisms are not equally dangerous. Personnel policy--these relations among the nationalities also bother them, since the quota system is an obstacle to the most capable people!

Social welfare policy--the radical critics want to institutionalize not social inequities, but even class differences! Relations in the Federation, the issue of our community consensus--all the problems come from the greater independence of the republics and provinces. Thus N. Kecmanovic in an article entitled "The Logic of Republic Statism" (NIN, 6 September 1981), examining at length the causes and types of "expansion" of republic-provincial statism, asserts that "the insistence that both statisms (federal and republic-provincial) are by definition equally dangerous is a case of bookish theorizing or cynicism on the part of those who represent that form of it which is currently dominant."

On the face of it, all this is done in the context of the struggle to democratize society. But it is interesting and--as the statisticians would say--significant that nowhere in these long-winded analyses is there any mention of the constitution, of the Law on Associated Labor, of the LCY Program, or even of scholarly and theoretical writings of our distinguished Marxists. (Examine N. Kecmanovic's other articles in NIN, for example, "Democratization or Decentralization" and "The Temptations of the Political Profession at Election Time.")

Imposition of the "Truth"

All the answers of critics of this kind which for the sake of consistency I have had to reduce to their ultimate consequence, bear not only the aroma, but also possess the firm construction--of liberalism, unitarianism and hegemonism. This is the policy of *laissez faire*, *laissez passer*--that everyone do as he wishes, and let everyone follow their own course, or, to be even more succinct and in our own idiom--anything goes!

These critics want to impose the "truth" that the competition of the able, inventive, experienced, gifted and the like has been thwarted, hampered and made impossible in our system by democratic procedure and considerations! They wish to return the entire problem, then, back to where our society stated a resolute "no," and in milder form--to that period, and we do not deny it, aware as we are of both its shortcomings and its--necessity--when political office and positions of leadership in sociopolitical organizations and communities, organizations and institutions were--decisive.

There are at least two important things which these "benefactors" of ours do not see: first, the results which have been made possible by self-management and its inherent democratic and freedom-loving atmosphere, and in particular implementation of the principle of the equality of the nationalities and ethnic minorities and of all the parts of our community; and second, they do not see that our problem is not primarily or exclusively in adopting this or that method of choosing those who will lead, but above all in the further struggle to strengthen the socioeconomic position of associated labor in self-management and to achieve the rule of the working class.

In so saying I do not, of course, wish to join in the current campaign which seeks "one key cause" of all our troubles. But I am convinced that there is very little talk today about this cause, i.e., inconsistencies and shortcomings in achievement of that goal, something that Tito often warned about.

Dubious Meditations

In confronting criticism of this kind and the soul-saving attitude of individuals, there is no way to avoid the question of responsibility of periodicals which so frequently and regularly offer extensive space for the full spread of dubious, malicious and extremely unpleasant meditations of self-styled theoreticians. It is simply amazing that an editor whose commitment must be beyond all doubt would give the green light to such articles. One needs to show a great deal of patience and goodwill to rid himself of the impression that such articles have not perhaps been written to order. The words recently uttered by Rodoljub Colakovic in connection with the content and messages of a feature article can be applied to them: "I am writing because I feel like a man who has drawn into his nostrils something slimy and repulsive--cold; it does not prick or nip, only slips along through the nostrils, but you know that one day, if you do not pluck it out as soon as possible, it could inflict a fatal sting in the heart itself...."

What are those factors, interests and elements which bring about the frequent forgetting of communist commitments, the commitments of self-management socialism, of the publication on behalf of dialogue--and dialogue we do need--of something which calls into question the very basis of our common existence? Is it possible that the motivation here is on the basis of "the worse it is, the better it is"? Is it possible that in this kind of situation calculations could be made after the pattern: only for someone, those over there, the others and so on, will it be worse? What a horrifying illusion!

No one needs to have it spelled out that the in-basket of every editor is always overflowing and even more than that given the shortage of newsprint. In such cases the question inevitably arises: What was thrown out when such articles were accepted? Such a selection could not have been made in the name of democracy, freedom of the press and the nurturing of dialogue and the like. That is more than obvious.

Response From Targeted Periodical

Belgrade NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE in Serbo-Croatian No 1609, 1 Nov 81
pp 3, 6

[Response by NIN editors to the OSLOBODJENJE article by Petar Jovic on 22 October: "The Nature of an Aggressive Attack"]

[Text] An article like "An Aggressive Attack by Bourgeois Consciousness" (OSLOBODJENJE, 22 October) leaves a man speechless. Is it possible that in 1981, in self-managing socialist Yugoslavia, a newspaper article could appear which accuses an author and a newspaper of nothing less than:

- i. calling into question the most important principles on which our community is based;
- ii. justification and revival of the old, moreover from the positions which are set in opposition to self-management;
- iii. a forgetting of communist commitments;
- iv. belittling of everything we have achieved so far;
- v. the aiming of our ship in some other direction, into some other bay;
- vi. deprecation of achievements in international relations, in personnel policy and in social welfare policy;
- vii. the calling into question of our common existence;
- viii. activity based on the slogan "The worse it is, the better it is";
- ix. evasion of the constitution, the Law on Associated Labor, the LCY Program and scientific and theoretical writings of our distinguished scholars;

x. opposition to the relations in the Federation established by the constitution and also to the independence of the republics and provinces;

xi. liberalism, unitarianism and hegemonism....

... And some dozen similar charges. And all of them were made without a single argument.

What are we to say about articles of this kind except they make all dialogue impossible before it has even begun! That is why we do not intend to engage in an analysis of Jovic's attacks. We are presenting his considerations for the reader's scrutiny, convinced that the reader himself will best know how to evaluate what period of time and what school of thought Jovic's reasonings belong to.

But still we must put a few questions explicitly. How do we account for the need--so evident in Jovic's article--for every unconventional manner of investigation in our society, whose vitality has always been based on reassessment of the functioning of its institutions and on an exploration for more perfect and better solutions, to be proclaimed an attack on the very foundations of the system? How do we account for the desire to prevent even reflection about alternatives, and that at a moment when this society confronts major difficulties in which it is imperative to seek a way out? Who has the right to proclaim criticism of republic statism a grave heresy, when the flowering of that statism has been assessed in the highest bodies of the Yugoslav party and by the public at large as one of the principal reasons for the troubles we confront?

Finally, how do we account for the presumption of the periodical in which Jovic has published his article in constantly and repeatedly delivering lectures on ideological orthodoxy to this and that Yugoslav newspaper with the severity of some political commissar and in passing out grades in moral and political fitness? To what ideological front should we assign that need to have apparitions of opponents of this system constantly appearing in the pages of other newspapers? Can it be that in our present situation there is no more urgent business than settling accounts with imagined enemies?

Attention should also be paid to the way in which Rodoljub Colakovic, a collaborator of NIN for many years, has become involved in the criticism of our newspaper. To take the words of an old revolutionary written in connection with a feature article on a Chetnik and to suggest to Colakovic that he might have similar words to say about the editorial policy of NIN is at the very least an act of rudeness toward this worthy man.

Finally, a point to reflect on: Dr Nenad Kecmanovic has been writing in NIN as a nonstaff collaborator for more than 5 years now. He lives in Sarajevo, he is active in civic life, he is a professor at the School of Political Science of Sarajevo University in the department called "Theoretical Foundations of the Political Sciences." Until recently he was the editor in chief of OPREDJELJENJA [COMMITMENTS], a journal concerned with the theory and practice of a self-managing socialist society which is published by the Marxist Studies Center of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Bosnia-Herzegovina as well as a member of the Sarajevo City Committee of the League of Communists. Kecmanovic

is also author of distinguished writings such as the book "Ideologija i istina" [Ideology and Truth] (published by Mladost, Belgrade, 1978) for which he received the "Veljko Vlahovic" Prize, and then the textbook "Marksizam i samoupravljanje" [Marxism and Self-Management], and so on. Had Conrade Jovic not imagined it, would it yet not have been "significant" for a party member and scholar so quickly in the pages of NIN, that is, under the full scrutiny of the public, to turn into a dangerous "opponent of the system" as he portrays him? Of course, Dr Kecmanovic's academic and political qualifications do not make him infallible by any means. On the contrary: his often polemical views have been a subject of dispute even in the pages of this magazine. But a reasoned debate is one thing, and the method of political discreditation used so freely by the author of the article "An Aggressive Attack by Bourgeois Consciousness," which is unsuitable to our system, is something else.

Rebuttal From 'OSLOBODJENJE'

Belgrade NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE in Serbo-Croatian No 1611, 15 Nov 81
pp 7, 10

[Rebuttal by Petar Jovic: "Arguments"]

[Text] The editors have received a large number of letters concerning the article by Petar Jovic entitled "An Aggressive Attack by Bourgeois Consciousness," published in our newspaper, and the response of NIN, which was entitled "The Nature of an Aggressive Attack." Some of them we have been publishing in abbreviated form. We are also publishing the rebuttal of Petar Jovic, also somewhat abbreviated, since its original length was altogether out of proportion to the size of our piece. The editors have tried not to detract from the spirit and thrust of Jovic's article. NIN has expressed its own attitude toward the subject of the dispute in its article "The Nature of an Aggressive Attack," published in No 1609. Petar Jovic's article follows below.

If the author of the response entitled "The Nature of an Aggressive Attack," which the entire editorial staff stood behind (though I still doubt this, since--to use NIN's "argument" in the response to the criticism addressed to that newspaper by an official of the League of Communists of Vojvodina--see NIN, 7 June 1981--that is even technically unfeasible), did not find in my article a single argument, then obviously this is a dispute of large proportions.

It honestly is difficult to understand how an exceptionally able editorial staff like that of NIN--I say this quite seriously and advisedly--can be "left speechless" in a situation as complex as the one in which the country finds itself when an individual and a newspaper come forth with an opinion that does not agree with the views of one of NIN's numerous nonstaff collaborators. What kind of freedom of opinion is that, and what, then, are the opportunities for overcoming the situation, if we do not allow someone to have a different opinion? And, still more definitely--what kind of presumption is that on the part of the editorial staff of a magazine when in such a situation it aspires to the role of

a supreme and infallible diagnostician and arbiter? Is it possible to claim a responsible and constructive role if one offers only his own vision as the only truth? This complacent and narcissoid position of infallibility has been demonstrated even by certain earlier comments of NIN's on criticism addressed to it.

On what basis and with what arguments, for example, can N. Kecmanovic assert that we are "today witnesses of what appears to be an extremely democratic atmosphere in our society" (NIN, 6 September 1981) or that "one has to wonder when and on what subject he can speak out freely without them gagging him with some admonition" (NIN, 19 July--the quotations that follow from NIN in 1981 are designated only by the day and the month of their publication).

Let the editorial staff of NIN explain as much as it likes whose propositions those are, but it is quite clear that this is the most commonplace lie and insinuation, while it is actually the author of those articles and his increasingly recognizable "assault" group of like-minded fellows who have the ambition to put a gag on others.

Without any sort of explanatory arguments, Kecmanovic uses the terms "the pathology of our political life" (18 October), "the overwhelming bureaucratic antisystem" (19 July), "full-fledged regional ideologies," "the caprices of the irrational behavior of portions of the regional bureaucracies," "the voluntarism of the regional bureaucracies" (6 September), and the like. Yet the titles which he wears so conspicuously so that no other public figure who has appeared in our periodicals in recent years can compare to him, impose on him the obligation of acting with greater propriety and offering at least the minimum clarification of the terms which he uses.

NIN did well to spot that N. Kecmanovic has experienced a kind of turnabout, and since it is documentation that is requested, here are some of the facts which have come to light and which might not have been taken note of, since we are referring to an author whose frequent appearances are unfailingly accompanied by always the same photograph. (This symptom is of interest not only to psychologists, but also to those who follow the birth and development of certain social phenomena. N. Kecmanovic and those like him, that is, desire to fascinate the public with the photograph which they select and on which they obviously insist to the editors!)

After having written several panegyric essays and reviews of books of our distinguished politicians in journals and other periodicals, pieces which were pearls, in late 1979 N. Kecmanovic "came to his senses" and published in KNJIZEVNE NOVINE (3 November 1979) an extremely adverse and sarcastic piece entitled "Even Politicians Write Books."

In the meantime, depending on whether his otherwise unbridled ambitions have been realized, Kecmanovic has been changing his attitude toward politicians, finally in his most recent articles subjecting all of them, in Yugoslavia generally, to malicious and even very primitive critical analyses which are not witty in the least. Though the general impression, reported on in the article entitled "An Aggressive Attack by Bourgeois Consciousness," cannot be illustrated by mere quotation, these characteristic phrases of Kecmanovic's, which we

now see are NIN's as well, are sufficiently eloquent: the essence of political ability (lies) in having good nerves, and one can get them even with sedatives; "the blame needs to be put on others for all the difficulties, failures, shortcomings, voluntarism, nepotism, privileges, primitivism, and stupidities, and the grousing of the people is justifiably redirected toward someone else" (6 September); regional leaders; local fanatics; the parent bureaucracy; "teams of regional standard-bearers in good form"; "a vertical train in which everyone refuses to react within the limits of his own powers and responsibilities" (19 July); "the election fever ... at least every 4th year affects a large number of political personnel and--as the malicious tongues would have it--display a symptomatic fear that some faux pas will spoil the outcome, a defensive keeping up of appearances or even a hastily contrived activism in order to offset bad impressions if only at the last moment ..." (18 October); "the criterion of ability ... figures as only one criterion no more important than the others in politics" (18 October); "... Is there any reason to be surprised at the preelection insomnia" of politicians; "... Professional hypocrisy requires ... that one exclaim even publicly that actually he would like to lose ..." (18 October); "Many leaders take an 'everyone help himself' attitude toward socially owned property," and so on and so on.

As for NIN's puzzlement as to what era we are in and as to whose "school of thought" (?) is anachronistic, instead of offering my own line of argument, I will quote another author whom I do not know personally, so that there is no possibility whatsoever for the agreements and "arrangements" at which some of our brave cavillers have achieved perfection! In KNJIZEVNE NOVINE (18 June 1981) Lj. Kljakic has the following to say in an article entitled "The Beeeg Little Town: Shot in the Dark":

"Fortunately, critical social consciousness has increased--since there is fertile soil for this in the dialectics of our fortunes and misfortunes--so that the conformism of the little town sounds more and more like a distant echo from the past. Even when a provincial opinion seeks a theoretical foundation after the pattern of Dr Prof Nenad I. Kecmanovic and his 'egalitarianism of the sick-bed' (recently in NIN), the result is nothing other than farce...."

Or, need we refer to the kind of sharp reactions to Kecmanovic's article in NIN concerning the initial silence of the news media about the events in Kosovo? In an article entitled "Who Is Planting 'Cuckoo Eggs' on Us" POLITIKA EKSPRES (23 April 1981) responded that those who "are now 'playing the hero'" in criticizing the press which was silent and who "back up" their assertions "with academic titles in front of their first and last names," who "always want to reap some personal benefit for themselves," while KNJIZEVNE NOVINE (7 May 1981) concluded a longer critical essay on the same article (in NIN) with these words: "A man simply gets upset when a professor, a Ph.D., in reflecting on television, did not arrive to help his colleagues in NIN, and in that same issue they published photographs of cars which were burned in Brickston...."

Kecmanovic's articles are the most vivid illustration of how individuals are formally in conformity with the positions of the LCY, but in actuality they are working--persistently and aggressively--to destroy and corrode the stands taken and role performed by the LC. For example, he overemphasizes the ability of

politicians and the selection from among a plurality of candidates to such an extent that the following conclusions are necessarily imposed, conclusions which are false, to put it mildly:

- i. that there are certain organized cases of resistance and all but plots against the able and against having more than one candidate;
- ii. that in the past and all the more recent elections the best and most competent people have not been elected and even, to go further, that those holding office at the present are mostly incompetent;
- iii. that after all it is not true that there are able people in every milieu, in every ethnic minority and so on;
- iv. that we do not have many able people at all. And so on and so on.

His prattle becomes more comprehensible only when one understands that he--having plunged into those unpublic affairs (he himself explicitly admits this--"as malicious tongues would have it," he mentions the underground, and the corridors and marketplace are, of course, represented as the sources of his information)--his speaking and writing from the standpoint of an investigation, or, more accurately, from the standpoint of creating opportunities for the nomination and election of a certain number of personnel who for various reasons are not now on the political scene. In actuality he is afraid that these people, and he himself first of all, will not perhaps be able to get a suitable place in the next election.

In any case, let us listen to Kecmanovic himself and his key idea about elections, on which he plays numerous and extensive variations:

"... The interest in a career, the spirit of competitive rivalry, the fight for prestige ... (is) something altogether normal" even for the political profession! (18 October) It is evident that these are not oversights and lapses committed in haste from the fact that he nostalgically notes that "in our system it is unknown ... for a man to rise politically on the basis of mass support and popularity" (1 November). What was that you said, professor, doctor? Was it not precisely on such waves of "popularity" that the prestige and influence of the leaders of the mass movement and liberalism grew to mythical proportions?

There is no doubt whatsoever where this society would be led--and not only the multinational, but also the mononational (if there are any) milieux--the personnel deemed capable according to Kecmanovic's criteria, and that very quickly and perhaps irrecoverably!

Is there any difficulty in reading these meditations to spot the petty agitation, demagogy, factionalism and careerism and all those illusions related to them; doesn't this lead to a still greater alienation of politics, something which the professor and doctor shown in the photograph appears to have no idea of?

Is it not clear that people with such "abilities" and ambitions in all systems, and this must be still more forcibly in our context--are unscrupulous about the means they use in achieving their goals, trample upon all objective criteria, so that intrigues, deceit, easy promises and grave deceptions and tricks are the inevitable concomitant of a personnel policy which would be based on such propositions?

Everything which Kecmanovic has hastily scribbled in this serial of his might somehow have been understood provided all the articles carried the common title of an analysis in the field of sociology or political science of the current arguments and themes of the political underground. I am not referring here solely to oppositionist views, but also to what the sociologists have termed the "un-public." Does anyone have to be convinced that the arguments, judgments and views from that unpublic sphere, from outside the system, and so on, must be even more the subject matter of scientific, political and in general public, or serious, critical debates, since in that way we will fight more effectively against everything that is deviant, oppositionist, and so on.

In an exhaustive interview on current politics which N. Kecmanovic has given and which has largely been published in the journal OPREDJELJENJA (No 7-8, September 1980) and peddled out in several other periodicals as well (NIN, Radio Sarajevo--Third Program, SVIJET), he actually expounded in responding to cleverly composed questions his theory of relations among the nationalities, which--to put it mildly--differs considerably from the policy of the LC. (For more on this, see my article entitled "'Brave' Questioning by a Newsman," OSLOBODJENJE, 10 October 1980.)

This long narrative has been necessary to demonstrate the following:

1. that the arguments of N. Kecmanovic are even more problematical than depicted in the article "An Aggressive Attack by Bourgeois Consciousness";
11. that I am neither the first, nor the only, nor the most severe critic of those arguments.

I will not enter into the other aspects of this group of problems, for example, that Kecmanovic is obviously bothered by something else, that in the end he is both insincere and timid, so that his "true" theses must be openly "elaborated" by other members of his informal group; that his aim is to cause a scandal, to put himself at the center of attention at any price, to represent himself as a victim.

7045

CSO: 2800/120

CROATIAN OFFICIAL CITES RESURGENCE OF BUREAUCRATISM

Belgrade NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE in Serbo-Croatian No 1608, 25 Oct 81
pp 12-13

[Interview with Vjekoslav Koprivnjak, director of the Center for Ideological and Theoretical Work of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Croatia, by Stevan Niksic; date and place not specified]

[Text] [Answer] "I think that we have frequently approached nationalism as something that is an element of an alienated part of the social consciousness; we have reacted insufficiently to what we are now calling economic nationalism, and we have even tolerated it as natural national interest! And this is now backfiring on us.

"In practice we have had more in action a Kavcic conception of the national economies, than the conception established by the Second LCY conference in 1972," says the director of the Center for Ideological and Theoretical Work of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Croatia, Vjekoslav Koprivnjak.

Among other things, the events in Kosovo have also influenced the fact that the problem of internationality relations in Yugoslavia has again entered political life as a "burning" issue. The public has sometimes almost treated this problem as an "inconvenient" and "ticklish" one. This is possibly why so many errors and myths have accumulated, that are still burdening this area in the life of contemporary Yugoslav society.

[Question] Can what happened in Kosovo in 1981 be compared with what took place in Croatia in 1971?

[Answer] There is no doubt that there are some similarities between these situations. First of all, in both cases the broader dimension was lost, the dimension of the class interest, the workers' interest. Nationalistic interests came predominantly to the forefront. One should not lose sight of what was pointed out at the 21st meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the LCY and in the Letter--everything that happened then in Croatia was not any kind of Croatian specialty. This was something that was taking place in all of Yugoslavia, while a dramatic expression of nationalistic euphoria took place in Croatia, and it was expressed there in its most acute form. Similarly, it could also be said today that nationalism is not reserved only for the Kosovo area, but is also present elsewhere.

Although our attention is most frequently and almost exclusively, in accordance with the traditional concepts, concentrated on two nationalisms, Croatian and Serbian, it has been shown that in fact all nationalisms are equally dangerous and that they latently arouse all of the other nationalisms. But Yugoslavia, as we are building it, is a community in which the Croatian-Serbian-Slovenian axis is not making the decisions. Any nationalism can thus set off great crises.

Federalist Tendencies in the LC

[Question] People are talking again about an increase in federalist tendencies in the League of Communists. Why?

[Answer] The League of Communists was undoubtedly confronted very sharply with this tendency at the beginning of the 1970's. One of the reasons for the 21st meeting and the Letter was in fact the tendency toward federalization within the LCY. This is why the 10th Congress and the 2nd LCY Conference took a very precise position against such a development. The fact is, however, that even after that we had certain practices that contained within themselves tendencies toward federalization of the LCY, and some blockage of the federal party center.

I think that our theoretical position in regard to this is very clear, but that we are forgetting it. The basic problem is how to keep the LCY from growing into a supranational organization, but without being a mere alliance of republican and provincial organizations. This fundamental dilemma has been repeated practically since the founding of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, and this should be kept in mind, but in every stage it requires an adequate method of organizational resolution.

We have forgotten that the League of Communists can be dissolved not only through sectarian politics, but also equally if everyone is in the party. We have today the problem of the identity of the Communists, not on a theoretical level, but in concrete action.

I think that today we also have a fairly unsatisfactory personnel situation. We even have people in very responsible positions who are simply not ready to participate in the implementation of a program as extensive and significant as the one we have drawn up. And now we are again blocked a little because everyone is waiting for a redistribution of the personnel solutions, and no one will rush ahead; especially some who cannot even rush ahead because they do not know what is really going on. Things are going well for them personally and they only think about how to preserve what they have, without really caring too much about what is taking place in society. I see this as one of the most crucial problems.

Unitarianism Is Not a Solution

[Question] Some controversies associated with the concept of unitarianism have lasted since the time when this phenomenon was publicly criticized for the first time, at the Eighth Congress of the LCY. What do you think of unitarianism today?

[Answer] To put it simply, the same as I did yesterday. It is equally dangerous, and we must be clear on this. We cannot solve the problems of Yugoslavia with a unitarian position. It was precisely on the basis of a criticism of what was entailed by a unitarian conception that we arrived at the present concrete solutions in the political system. At this time, when we are facing difficulties, it may seem that we should turn things back, but this would mean having the same problems again after a certain period of time. This leads us to a conclusion that in my opinion is exceptionally significant, and to something that Vladimir Bakarić stressed on one occasion back in 1971: the nation should be based on self-management, and not on the state.

The Strong Position of the Bureaucracy

[Question] Some old problems have become exacerbated again. Doesn't this indicate that the new system created after the reform of the Federation has in fact not been very productive either?

[Answer] This new system was not fully implemented. I think that this was the main problem. Consultation and agreement were too frequently carried out between the various working bodies of the executive agencies of the Federation and the republics and provinces, which was undoubtedly a new step, but insufficient in view of the essence of the concept of the Yugoslav federation. On the other hand, this direction of having the nation based on self-management was not developed to a sufficient extent. What happened was precisely what the action through the 21st meeting and the Letter was initiated against: the bureaucracy has again come into a fairly strong position. This raises the question of how this was possible.

[Question] Really: how?

[Answer] A few years ago, before Kosovo and the other things that have happened in the meantime, we and many others warned about this. The consultation and agreement of the republics and provinces, in the way in which it is done, is a great step, but an insufficient one, because delegate assemblies and associated labor are the only ones who can be the main participants in this process. If the role of these participants is taken by someone else, in the long term a crisis is unavoidable.

Yugoslavianism Under a Mortgage

[Question] The concept of "Yugoslavianism" is also one of those which still cause many misunderstandings. How do you interpret this?

[Answer] It seems to me that the problem is not in the theoretical approach to this matter but in something else. There is no doubt that here Yugoslavianism is burdened with a certain mortgage of unitarianism. Some narrower interest has frequently been known to hide behind a defense of Yugoslav interests. We, however, have at any rate fallen short in not sufficiently affirming the positive aspects of Yugoslavianism in the sense of belonging to the Yugoslav community.

Yugoslavia was not united by a myth about the Slavs or Yugoslavianism, but precisely by the interests of its peoples. But in practice we have not presented an operative concept that would demonstrate this to a sufficient extent. In general, except when certain urgent situations arise, we avoid discussing internationality relationships. We are frequently inclined to believe that everything is all right in regard to this, but we do not wish to verify this assertion. The cause of all this is probably a collective consciousness that it is better not to tinker with this, and possibly also because we have had such terribly difficult and bloody historical experiences.

The Croatian "Model"

[Question] The Italians who live in Croatia and Slovenia have their own united organization, along with the members of other nationalities in Croatia. Such organizations do not exist in other republics and provinces, and it even seems that they would not be desirable. How do you interpret these differences?

[Answer] The differences have arisen from historical circumstances. To be precise, the unions of nationalities in Croatia were mostly formed during World War II, and today they are operating exclusively within the framework of SSRN Croatia. One of the characteristics of Yugoslavia is precisely the fact that in our country the same goals can be achieved in different ways in different republics and provinces.

[Question] Our citizens abroad also gather, with the blessing of Yugoslav political authorities, on a national basis. Let us say, the members of some nationalities abroad, for example Albanians from Kosovo, have their own clubs, while others do not. Can't an agreement be reached in Yugoslavia on a uniform policy regarding this?

[Answer] This practice is acceptable to me solely under the condition that citizens of exclusively one nationality are located in a given place, and that moreover the active goal of building Yugoslav unity is not lost in these clubs.

[Question] There are still many disagreements over the symbols of a nation and national statehood. Is the fact that Croatia is the only Yugoslav republic with its own anthem that is played on official occasions causing some misunderstandings in practice? From the standpoint of standard protocol, it might possibly be logical to have "Lijepa nasa" played when some official of Croatia comes on an official visit to another republic. But this is still not done. Why?

[Answer] You should first of all answer the question of whether you are possibly excited by the playing of the hymn "Lijepa nasa," and how it excites you... But the fact that it is not played as a matter of protocol on the occasion of a visit by an official of Croatia to other republics and provinces indicates that all of us together still perceive Yugoslavia as a united community, and not as a collection of republican states.

One Should Not Put Everything Into the Same Basket

[Question] Where are those young people today who were subject to nationalist euphoria in Croatia at the beginning of the 1970's? What happened to them later on?

[Answer] Some of them are still showing themselves to the nationalists; others are doing their jobs and trying to rehabilitate themselves; and some have already rehabilitated themselves. I think that those who are trying to rehabilitate themselves should be offered the opportunity to do so, and I think that society has given them a fair amount of chances. Most of those people, nevertheless, have realized what this was all about. The problem, however, is that some of the ideologies have not renounced their ideas. It would be difficult to believe that anything is possible that way. They are continuing to act as they used to.

I think that society should first of all act in a cultured manner, and that this is the field where we are in fact giving concrete expression to the humanity of our society. In accordance with this, I think that with respect to punishment, one should differentiate those who did the manipulating and those who were manipulated. It is really harmful and dangerous to put everything together into the same basket.

9909

CSO: 2800/99

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

Jan. 5, 1982